

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Sacramento)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

TAKNEECA KEAN GLASS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C078170

(Super. Ct. No. 13F01372)

Appointed counsel for defendant Takneeca Kean Glass has filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*)). Having reviewed the record as required by *Wende*, we affirm the judgment.

BACKGROUND

We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 124.)

Defendant and a codefendant, Willis Webster, were employees at Crown Beauty and Wigs. They stole wigs and hair weaves valued at over \$950. Defendant pleaded no contest to felony grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a))¹ and admitted a prior conviction (§§ 667, subds. (b) - (i), 1170.12). The remaining counts and allegations were dismissed with a *Harvey* waiver.²

In accordance with the plea, the trial court sentenced defendant to a term of 16 months, doubled pursuant to the strike, and awarded her one day of presentence custody credit. The trial court imposed a \$280 restitution fine (§ 1202.4), and a corresponding parole revocation fine suspended unless parole is revoked (§ 1202.45), a \$40 court operations fee (§ 1465.8), and a \$30 conviction assessment (Gov. Code, § 70373). The trial court reserved jurisdiction on direct victim restitution. Defendant did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

DISCUSSION

Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks us to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Counsel advised defendant of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed, and we have received no communication from defendant. We have undertaken an examination of the entire record and find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

² *People v. Harvey* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 754.

HULL, J.

We concur:

RAYE, P. J.

NICHOLSON, J.